



INFORMATION PAPER

FIFTH MEETING OF THE ALLPIRG/ADVISORY GROUP

(Montreal, 23 – 24 March 2006)

Agenda Item 3: Aviation Safety

REGIONAL SAFETY CASES

(Presented by the Chairman, North Atlantic Systems Planning Group (NAT SPG))

SUMMARY

This paper discusses the regional safety cases under the auspices of the North Atlantic Systems Planning Group (NAT SPG) to streamline the interactions between national supervisory authorities (NSAs) and air traffic management (ATM) service providers.

Action by ALLPIRG/5 is in paragraph 2.

1. DISCUSSION

1.1 Until fairly recently, air traffic control was considered a public service to be discharged by government agencies. Typically the same agency would have separate divisions responsible, respectively, for service provision and oversight thereof. It has long been recognised that the close association of these two functions was undesirable; this (among other things) has led to their assignment to different entities. In many cases only the supervisory function has been retained by the government agency, with the service provision being transferred to a corporate entity, whether public or private.

1.2 The next logical step in the evolution of ATS service provision is the removal of the “one to one” link between the area of responsibility of the service provider and that of the associated supervisory authority, typically through the consolidation of service provision in airspace for which multiple national supervisory authorities (NSAs) have an oversight responsibility.

1.3 This trend has already started in the NAT region, on the one hand through the delegation of an entire FIR (the Greenland FIR) to two service providers (ICAA and NavCanada) and on the other

through the delegation of multiple smaller blocks of airspace across FIR boundaries for operational reasons.

1.4 In this environment it is clearly no longer sufficient for a service provider to demonstrate to a single NSA that a new procedure/technology meets the appropriate safety standards, nor is it clear that the NSA only needs to evaluate the implementation of said procedure/technology by a single service provider. This “many to many” relationship makes it extremely desirable that both the preparation and evaluation of “safety cases” be subject to regional cooperation.

1.5 While such a cooperative approach has been used in the past during major implementation efforts such as the Minimum Navigation Performance Specification (MNPS) and Reduced Vertical Separation Minima (RVSM), it is now intended to become normal practice.

1.6 The North Atlantic Implementation Management Group (NAT IMG) is responsible for implementation issues on behalf of the NAT SPG. In dealing with the work related to the associated safety issues on a regional basis the IMG refers that work to one of its subgroups, the Safety Analysis and Reduced Separation Implementation Group (SARSIG), which is composed of experts in the fields of ATM operations, mathematics and risk assessment.

1.7 While it is clear that some aspects of safety assessment will always remain tied to a particular implementation, it is intended that the SARSIG prepare common regional safety cases on those other aspects which are universal. This, coupled with corresponding cooperation among the NSAs, should greatly ease the process of implementing service enhancements.

2. ACTION BY ALLPIRG

2.1 The ALLPIRG/5 Meeting is invited to note information provided in this paper regarding the attempt by one region to streamline the interactions between NSAs and ATM Service Providers.

— END —